Conv. with RDH 6/3/46, 11:30 am

1) RDH said I'm not an analyst, wants only PHDs for analysts. Said he'd like to use me as an r. asst but didn't know if he could. asked for samples of my work, which I sent 6/4/46. They were returned 8/21/46 without comment.

2) Discussion of sophisticated personnel – said flatly I wasn't an analyst despite CSC approval + ex. off rating.

3) Had been assigned Chin LA, which I was to assign, compose, edit daily, late 3/46. Continued to July. In July I, with rest of office, assigned to Nationalism project, as yet incomplete. Dr F.L. Ryan + I did economic parts, which, at time amalgamation, others were assigned to various branches, I was sent to Functional analysis but kept actually under Goldman on Nationalism. atwood told me he wasn't to give me any credit + he didn't. He + I both expected I'd be transferred, as RDH said I would be. During this time I was, in effect, an outcast within the division, my name even having been removed from even the routing slip, not to return until 4/47. During this period I got a very clear indication I'd get a low eff rat. Went to see Merle + told him. Saw RDH on return + told him gist of conv. Merle. He said to continue on Nationalism as this would have some value. Thereafter I was put on a separate project + physically moved (R+T) out of Atwood's branch. RDH then told me it'd be more a asst under him, that he'd write the report because he was one of the 6 or 7 experts in the world on the subject. Gave me an

outline to follow. Also told me membership in the Falange was of no significance. I told him I had seen in my life physical anything & of course wouldn't prejudge the Falange. He then required me to [illegible] all the basic materials which he had ordered from DC/R in my name. Lacking these, I consulted the division files. In this meeting I had told RDH I'd like to go out of the division for material, to sources I knew to be competent & dependable. This permission was never ~~[illegible]~~ given, although I requested it repeatedly.

As I began to exhaust the file material & got a number of requests via DCR for the data, which I had never seen, I got concerned. & began to try & see RDH. I failed. (See note of 12/10) However, RDH did not see me. I continued to try to see him & again bumped into him this time a little after 2 pm 12/20 in the lunch bar. (memo 12/20) It was not until a little after 3 pm the last working day of the year, when most people come out of the office, that he called me in, gave me the DC/R material saying he hadn't yet had chance to go over it, and asked me to keep it together, which I have done, to this day, despite the great burden this added to the work. Thereafter he saw me once. In early Feb. JMD said he was going to look after the report & he came to my office & prepared an outline covering the entire hemisphere which he submitted to RDH, who later changed it, making it somewhat more difficult to use intelligently. I was going over the DCR data. A short while later I got a large volume of material which RE has had. At about the same time I encountered RDH in the hall. He said we should be getting something out soon. I replied if he desired I could start then & there, but that this RE material had just come in & I still had had the chance to go over & get new data. He said only to go over the RE data. Thereafter DMD told me I'd better speed it up & I told him of the above RDH conversation & he assented. He said the consumer, Amb. Bowers, was impatient for the report which surprised me since I was to have seen everything relating to the subject & hadn't seen that. He also said to do Arg., even tho' the outline of the entire plan was to do the Hemisphere as a unit, & no effort had been made to have a complete story in each country, which was a complete impossibility.

End Feb I went in to see DMD. RDH joined us. We discussed it & I told him I planned to use his 4M statement, a general word which would be necessary in the final job & advisable to make sense of the Arg. section & of the new data on just what the Falange was & other Spanish material which I visualized as an appendix. He okayed. Then DMD got sick, and I was sick weeks of 3/3. However, on 3/18 I gave DMD the rough draft, 80 pp & about 15 pp footnotes (memo to him)

Next I heard was some time after RDH went to LA. He called me in.

ER dated 3/21, although that was day RDH left.

DMD hadn't read paper until early, yet he said he was relaying RDH's remarks. Read me RDH's marginal comments on the 12-15-90 he had read. These were invalid & in some cases ridiculous. When I pressed DMD he read me a memo to him from RDH commending my presentation, containing critical comments along the line of his marginal notes & adding I could have an ER of at most good, & anything less DMD saw fit. I asked DMD his opinion (he had not discussed it with me, as my memo had requested). He merely paraphrased RDH, adding that it was what he considered a "C" paper. I pointed out it was & was only intended to be a rough draft, that I had never been expected to write it, that the outline had been prepared for the firm, not just Ag., showed the obvious inaccuracy of the specific criticisms, pointed out the complete lack of supervision or direction, the other handicaps of which he had personal knowledge. He conceded most of the criticisms would have been eliminated if there had been the requisite supervision, certainly the slight stylistic ones, for the supervisor would have known RDH's tastes & the client, since this was the first & only report he had assigned & that nobody been in a position to learn. In the face of this all DMD was able to say was that it was a "C" paper, & he again read his information from RDH. I questioned the propriety of this, pointing out that RDH was here acting as reviewing officer as well, & only on the basis of a few pages, not a year's work. DMD said he had no authority to consider anything else. He also said I should have "found" work, or volunteered. When I took him up on this point he was unable to tell me who for whom I should have volunteered. He, himself was one of those for whom I had, in fact, volunteered. (memo of 10/7) also OC on Preim.

He told me if he were in my place he'd find the atmosphere disgusting. I said I couldn't agree more.

He said he'd ~~consider it~~ think it over. After thinking this over & checking on the points I returned & convinced him of the apparent violations of regulations. However, on what he described the very last possible day 4/25 he informed me he had submitted the ER as it was. He later sent me a copy of a memo to RDH. (memo of 4/25)

Note that in his
Criticisms RDH opposed
what he had okay in conf.
of wk 3/10.

Use quotes rather than
paraphrase or interpretation,
since RDH would want to
see them.

Attacks on validity of
FBI as source

Use of contradiction

Falange as part of
Sp govt, not just pol party

DMD volunteered last Fri he had had no right to rate me, since I had in fact, never worked for him.

Note that DMD signed for RDH "good" although RDH ought to have seen first, & did sign.

Supervisor did rate
" wasn't consulted.